

Delta Lambda ($\Delta\Lambda$) Chapter
Sigma Theta Tau ($\Sigma\Theta\tau$) International
Anne G. Perry New Investigator Award Criteria

1. Purpose: To support Chapter members as new investigators, stimulate research within the Chapter and contribute to the advancement of nursing research. Funds are not for thesis or dissertation work. Funds are not to be used for indirect cost recovery or institutional administrative overhead costs.
2. Funding: To be budgeted by the Finance Committee and approved by the Executive Board. Sigma Theta Tau International and the Delta Lambda Chapter do not allow for facilities and administration recovery. Checks will be issued to the awardee's institution.
3. Award Amount: up to \$1,500
4. Eligibility Criteria: The applicant shall:
 - A. Be a new investigator without an established program of research.
 - B. Be a doctorally-prepared nurse
 - C. Begin the proposed project within 5 years of completing dissertation or capstone project.
 - D. Be an active dues paying member of Delta Lambda. Delta Lambda Chapter Board of Directors members are not eligible.
 - E. Have a well-defined research project with implications for nursing and consistent with the purposes of Sigma Theta Tau (see attached criteria).
 - F. Be the principal investigator of the research project.
 - G. Upon completion of the research, agree to submit an abstract for review, and if accepted, present at a Delta Lambda Chapter meeting.
5. Review Panel:
 - A. Membership:
 1. Chairperson will be elected by the membership.
 2. Awards chairperson cannot serve on the review panel.
 3. Panel will consist of three doctorally-prepared members of Delta Lambda and may be members of the Delta Lambda Chapter Board of Directors.
 4. At least one panel member will not be a Saint Louis University faculty member.
 - B. Process for Selection:
 1. The panel may request reviews and consultation with others as needed.
 2. The panel will determine the appropriateness of the budget as well as review the science.
 3. The panel will make recommendation of award recipient to the Awards chairperson who will in turn make recommendations to the Delta Lambda Chapter Board of Directors.
5. Protection of the Rights of Human Subjects: Prior to the presentation of the monies, the Awards Committee must receive a copy of the approval(s) of the IRB at the institution(s) where the research will be conducted. If no IRB exists at the institution(s) where the research will be conducted, the Saint Louis University IRB will serve as the IRB for approval of the research.
6. Deadlines:
 - A. A call for proposals will go out by email and appear in the winter newsletter.
 - B. Applications must be submitted by March 31 of the given year.
 - C. The award recipient will be notified prior to the Induction Ceremony by the review panel chairperson.
 - D. The award will be announced and presented at the Induction Ceremony.

Delta Lambda ($\Delta\Lambda$) Chapter
Sigma Theta Tau ($\Sigma\Theta\tau$) International
Anne G. Perry New Investigator Award

Application Cover Page (should be separate from the rest of the application)

1. Name _____

2. Contact Information

Street Address	
Apartment/ Suite Number	
City	
State	
Zip Code	
E-Mail Address	
Work Phone Number	
Cell Phone Number	

Applicant Instructions

Please address the following in the beginning of your proposal:

1. Title of project and the award for which you are applying
2. Dissertation completion date (date degree was conferred)
3. Anticipated research start and completion date
4. Status of IRB Approval
5. Attach a research budget with justification.

Research Plan (limit 3 pages, 12-pt Arial font, 1/2 inch margins)

1. Introduction to Application
2. Specific Aims
3. Research Strategy
 - a. Significance
 - b. Innovation
 - c. Approach (can include preliminary studies)

Please submit the original and 3 copies of the entire application. Because this will be a blind review, your name should appear only on the Application Cover Page.

Biographical Sketch (use NIH format and length, see next page)

- A new Personal Statement will be incorporated as Part A, changing the parts formerly called A, B, and C to Parts B, C, and D.
- Applicants should limit the list of selected peer-reviewed publications to no more than 15. These 15 publications should be chosen on the basis of recency, importance to the field, and relevance to the proposed research.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Provide the following information for the Senior/key personnel and other significant contributors in the order listed on Form Page 2.
Follow this format for each person. **DO NOT EXCEED FOUR PAGES.**

NAME	POSITION TITLE		
eRA COMMONS USER NAME (credential, e.g., agency login)			
EDUCATION/TRAINING <i>(Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education, such as nursing, include postdoctoral training and residency training if applicable.)</i>			
INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE <i>(if applicable)</i>	MM/YY	FIELD OF STUDY

NOTE: The Biographical Sketch may not exceed four pages. Follow the formats and instructions below.

A. Personal Statement

Briefly describe why your experience and qualifications make you particularly well-suited for your role (e.g., PD/PI, mentor, participating faculty) in the project that is the subject of the application.

B. Positions and Honors

List in chronological order previous positions, concluding with the present position. List any honors. Include present membership on any Federal Government public advisory committee.

C. Selected Peer-reviewed Publications

Limit the list of selected peer-reviewed publications or manuscripts in press to no more than 15. Do not include manuscripts submitted or in preparation. The individual may choose to include selected publications based on recency, importance to the field, and/or relevance to the proposed research.

D. Research Support

List both selected ongoing and completed research projects for the past three years (Federal or non-Federally-supported). *Begin with the projects that are most relevant to the research proposed in the application.* Briefly indicate the overall goals of the projects and responsibilities of the key person identified on the Biographical Sketch. Do not include number of person months or direct costs.

Review Criteria

Application #:

Project Title:

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment in consideration of the following five scored review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have scholarly impact.

Overall impact rating:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

1. Significance rating:

Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific/scholarly knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

2. Investigator(s) rating:

Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)?

Strengths:

-

Weaknesses

-

3. Innovation rating:

Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research, other scholarly activities, or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

4. Approach rating:

Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?

Strengths

•

Weaknesses

•

5. **Likelihood rating:** If this project is completed successfully, what is the likelihood that it will attract external funding that will extend/enhance the outcomes of the project?

NOTE: Funding likelihood rating has been modified: 9-point rating with 1=Very High and 9=Very Low.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very High		Somewhat High		Moderate		Somewhat Low		Very Low

Reviewer Guidance and Chart

- For the impact/priority score and for the individual criterion scores, the far right column (in the table below) provides a descriptive guide of how strengths and weaknesses are considered in assigning a rating
 - o **Minor weakness:** easily addressable weakness, does not substantially lessen impact
 - o **Moderate weakness:** lessens impact
 - o **Major weakness:** Severely limits impact

Scoring Descriptions

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

